

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Monday, July 10, 1972

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees. The Honourable Member for Radisson.

REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the second report of the Standing Committee on Industrial Relations.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Industrial Relations beg leave to present the following as their second report.

Your Committee has considered Bill:

No. 63 - An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act.

And has agreed to report the same with certain amendments. All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Flin Flon that the report of the Committee be received.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports; Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I wish to introduce a Bill that has been on the Order Paper for some time. I move, seconded by the Member for La Verendrye, that first reading be given to An Act to amend The City of Winnipeg Act.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Oral Questions. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Leader of the Opposition) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Acting Minister of Mines and Natural Resources or to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. It involves Tantalum Mine. I wonder if he could indicate to the House whether the agreement between Tantalum Mining Corporation of Canada Limited and the Goldrun Properties which require Tantalum to provide financing to the Australian company are still in effect?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, I'll take the question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister could take as notice as well whether the Manitoba Development Corporation will be required to raise additional money in connection with the commitments in Australia; as well if he would undertake to give us information on the shares and the majority ownership in Goldrun.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'll take the supplementary question as notice also.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. I. H. (IZZY) ASPER (Leader of the Liberal Party) (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. On the basis of what documentary information or evidence did the First Minister tell this House on Friday evening that we were incorrect in stating that Chemalloy was selling us for \$1.5 million, 15 percent of Tanco, that they had themselves paid \$300,000 for one and a half years ago. On the basis of what documentary evidence did the Premier make that statement?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, the assumption on the honourable member's question is incorrect.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, the question ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The honourable member may ask a question, not debate the issue.

MR. ASPER: My question is to the First Minister, Mr. Speaker. Did the Premier on Friday evening tell this House --(Interjection)-- It certainly is a question. --(Interjection)-- Yes. Did the Premier tell this House on Friday evening that Chemalloy did not buy the 15 per cent that they're selling to the Government of Manitoba in Tantalum Mining Corporation, that they did not buy it for \$300,000 plus?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, \$300,000 plus covers quite a wide area I should think. Certainly I indicated on Friday that the statement or comment by my honourable friend that Chemalloy had purchased the equivalent amount within the last twelve month period for one-quarter of the price was incorrect and I certainly stand by that. No transaction took place within the last twelve month period and the amount to be compared certainly is not our 15 per cent but rather 25 per cent; and in addition to that the amount of the transaction was in excess of \$2 million - it was \$2.2 million approximately.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, to the First Minister. In view of sworn documents and signed agreements which are available in the Court of Queen's Bench in Manitoba and which I obtained this morning, stating that Chemalloy bought 60 per cent of Tanco . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The question is argumentative and out of order. The honourable member care to rephrase it?

MR. ASPER: Are the documents sworn and signed in the Court of Queen's Bench in Manitoba that state that Chemalloy bought 60 per cent of Tanco for 1,250 million on February 22, 1971 - are they then incorrect?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I would have no way of knowing if they're incorrect within the context with which the honourable member puts his question. I can advise my honourable friend that I was advised by officers of the Manitoba Development Corporation that the transaction referred to by my honourable friend was one entered into, not within the last 12 months as he suggests, but considerably longer than that, earlier than that, and that the amount, consideration of the transaction was \$2.2 million approximately. That's the information given me by officers of the MDC.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Would the House like me or would the Speaker ask me to table these documents.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. There is many procedures available to the honourable member as there are members in this House, if not more. This is the question period, it is not a time to debate or to argue any point of merit whatsoever. Orders of the Day. The Attorney-General.

HON. A. H. MACKLING, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (St. James): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table a return to an Order of the House No. 37.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder if he can indicate whether anyone from the government inspected the mining claims in Quebec owned by Tantalum Mines.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as this is a technical, very detailed question I'll take it as notice.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question. I wonder if the Minister can indicate whether it's the intention of the Provincial Government to provide funding for a mining exploration in Quebec.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I think the honourable member should know what the answer is. Nevertheless it is a policy question, but it is customary for the MDC to confine it's investments to the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable the First Minister. Inasmuch as the government through MDC is acquiring or has acquired a 25 per cent interest in Tantalum Mining, and inasmuch as Chemalloy owns presumably the other 75 per cent and Chemalloy is being actively traded on the Toronto Mining Exchange, is the Minister considering any curtailment or restrictions on speculation in this stock by insiders, employees of the government or MDC, assuming that some expansion programs may be undertaken?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, there are to my knowledge certain known rules governing

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) trading in stocks and securities and those which respective provincial governments have seen fit to adopt with respect to the operations of the share market, stock market, would apply.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Industry and Commerce, I wonder if he could indicate whether within the 12 months preceding the government's purchase into Tantalum, there were any transactions in which interests, agreements, rights were transferred out of the company to Chemalloy?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'll take the question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct a question to the Honourable the House Leader. Can he indicate to us whether or not there are any more new bills to be introduced during this session?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Not to my immediate knowledge, Mr. Speaker. I haven't checked with the Opposition yet to see whether or not they may be introducing some more private members' bills. If you recall, Sir, on a couple of occasions the House Leader was placed in a very embarrassing position having answered no, and then Opposition tossed in --(Interjection)-- oh you mind your business for a minute - tossed in one or two bills. But as far as memory serves me at the present time there will be no more government measures. I say that with a caveat that there may be, but as far as my knowledge at the present time is concerned, no.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, the question is to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. In view of the fact that the Manitoba Development Corporation has guaranteed the payment of \$2 million within 18 months on behalf of Tantalum Mining Corporation, is it the intention or the plan of the government to advance a further \$2 million to Tantalum Mining, or what source of funds does the government intend to use for paying off the \$2 million to the American companies.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is one of policy, out of order. The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney-General. I wonder if he could indicate whether the investigation at Nelson House has been completed, and if so are any charges going to be laid?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I do recall receiving a more definitive report on that matter and it is my recollection of the report that the recommendation is that no charges be laid. There was careful review of the matter, there has been some irregularity in the administration of funds but no deliberate misappropriation of funds took place in the opinion of those people who inspected the records and checked into the accounts that were involved, and therefore, I do not believe that there will be any charges laid.

MR. BOROWSKI: A further question, Mr. Speaker. Regarding a letter he received a few days ago from Ethel D'Eschambault of the MMF at Thompson making serious allegations of I think 90 cheques missing, has the Attorney-General caused an investigation to be started regarding these serious allegations?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I don't recall the specific disposition of that matter, I believe though I did refer it to staff for inquiry and recommendation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, another subject. Could the Attorney-General indicate to the House whether he has checked in to see if Bertha Rand's civil rights were violated under the new Human Rights Act?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I do believe that question is asking for a legal opinion. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Public Works. Is the original estimates for construction of the Convention Centre - are the estimates still holding firm?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

HON. RUSSELL DOERN (Minister of Public Works) (Elmwood): To the best of our knowledge, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary. Is it true that the foundation costs are considerably higher than they were originally estimated?

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I am unable to answer all detailed questions on the Convention Centre, I would have to refer my honourable friend to the Winnipeg Council. But I would also indicate to him that the Provincial Government's commitment of seven and a half million dollars is firm and is limited.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary. Perhaps the Minister would take the question as notice and also find out what is the new estimate - what is the new estimate for the construction of the Convention Centre?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct a question to the Honourable the First Minister. I wonder if he can indicate to the House when he intends to appoint a full time Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and Environmental Management?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. Further to his answer in the House on Friday evening relative to King Choy in which he stated that the King Choy investment was the only one that had gone sour made by his government, would he confirm that Omnitheatre Limited has been (a) staff completely dismissed; and (b) the government stands to lose \$300,000; (c) the public will lose, the trade creditors will lose \$145,000; and (d) the government has been advised to close it up?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: No, Mr. Speaker, I'm not prepared to confirm that at all, as a matter of fact on the basis of information given me just recently last week, it would seem that the contrary is the probability and that after some initial difficulty it might be expected the enterprise seems to have some prospect of financial viability.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, to the First Minister. Is it true that the \$300,000 that the government has invested in the company is lost?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, that is not true to the best of my recollection of the advice given me just last week which was to the contrary.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. I wonder if the First Minister can confirm that the undertaking that was given by Dr. Briant at the Standing Committee of Economic Development that if the government owned more than two-thirds of any corporation they would undertake to see the creditors will all be paid, applies as well in the Omnitheatre situation?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I have no recollection of the assumption that is implicit in the honourable member's question so I'll have to take that as notice, on behalf of the Minister of Industry and Commerce will want to take that as notice as well.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Acting Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and as Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder if he can indicate that during the period of negotiations with respect to the purchase of the Tantalum interest there was a discussion with Chemalloy about the development of their interest at the Rusty Lake and Ruttan Lake area in Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Again the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is asking very detailed questions, so I will take that as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Can the Minister advise whether owing to the repeated computer difficulties in Autopac an eastern Canadian consulting firm has been retained to work on our computer reprogramming cycling to correct the errors, and what has emerged in respect of this program by the eastern consultants?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question addressed, again and again I've had to indicate that the Computer Centre is not within the jurisdiction of Autopac itself and he would have to address himself to the Minister that would be involved with the Computer Centre and from there he would receive the answer to his question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, then my question would be best redirected to the Minister of Highways. Is it true that an eastern Canadian computer consulting firm --(Interjection)-- well, Mr. Speaker, unless I get a voluntary disclosure by the government who I should address my question to, I'll ask it to every member of government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend he's so knowledgeable of the processes of government that he may undertake a little homework, and then he'll know the Minister that is responsible without going through the whole roster.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Health. Is the government setting up a community clinic at Winkler or are they investing any moneys in such a clinic?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health and Social Development) (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, the government itself is not setting up a community health centre in Winkler.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Acting Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and as Minister of Industry and Commerce. It relates to a statement by V.H. Atrill Chairman of the Great Plains Committee with respect to moving Arctic gas by aircraft which he claims was cheaper than by pipeline. But more specifically in a statement he indicated that there were ...

MR. SPEAKER: Question please.

MR. SPIVAK: And this is the question, Mr. Speaker, and all I am attempting to do is to preface it, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister is that Mr. Atrill made reference to the fact that at least three mining developments in an advanced stage of planning all within 600 miles of Churchill that could in fact have their product delivered by plane to Churchill. I wonder if the Minister could indicate whether he's aware of the three mining developments, whether there's been a study made by the department, whether the potential of Churchill being utilized has in fact been examined.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. As I've indicated on occasion I do believe if the honourable member would give courtesy of notifying the Minister he probably could answer the question.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed, I should like to indicate we have as a guest Mr. John Komar, MLA for Nipiwini of Saskatchewan Legislative Assembly. On behalf of all the honourable members, I welcome you here today.

The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a further question to the Honourable Minister of Health. Has the government given authority, assurance to a group that is setting up a clinic in Winkler to collect any balances that they may have or deficits from taxes to the municipalities.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development.

MR. TOUPIN: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, to the Acting Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I wonder if he could take as notice the question that was posed to him before.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to take as notice any technical detailed questions the Honourable Leader of the Opposition seems to be very good at putting without giving us courtesy of advance notice. But I reject the inference that we are not promoting the Port of Churchill because that was definitely implied in his earlier question. It's totally rejected.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation. Has the government taken any action with the problem of infestation of bears in our Falcon Lake and Grand Beach area in the park, in the trailer park areas?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

HON. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (Minister of Tourism and Recreation) (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I haven't heard any complaints.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I have a further question to the Attorney-General regarding Bertha Rand. Can we expect him to take action to protect her civil rights under the new Human Rights Act, in a similar fashion as he has for the money smugglers.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, if the lady in question has a problem in respect to obtaining legal counsel and it is appropriate under either the existing legal aid scheme, or should litigation commence after the new comprehensive legal aid scheme comes into effect later on this year, then I'm sure that she will be given the same degree of access to legal counsel as any other citizen would in the event that charges are proceeded with.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I was not referring to legal aid, I was referring to civil rights.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member place his question.

MR. BOROWSKI: And I am asking the Attorney-General will he undertake the same action as he did in the case of a Dauphin lady who was being fired because she was married to a person. Will he undertake the same action to protect the rights of Bertha Rand as he did in the case of the Dauphin lady?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, there is no parallel between the cases that the honourable member refers to. In respect to the problem involving the Dauphin situation where an employee claimed that there was discrimination because of sex, that matter was successfully resolved in favour of the employer. What is involved in the case of the lady in St. James, Mrs. Rand, is not discrimination against her per se, as I understand there is a by-law of the City of Winnipeg which makes provision for a specific number of pets to be owned in any given residence and that is a law that affects all, it doesn't discriminate against Bertha Rand.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, one further question to the Minister of Health. Has the government given authority through the Hospital Commission to give land to this committee that is setting up a clinic from the Winkler Hospital district.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development.

MR. TOUPIN: Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Acting Minister of Mines. In view of the statement made by the President of Falconbridge at the opening of the Dominican Republican Mine of Falconbridge, nickel mine, and the statement by International Nickel that they too will be exploiting nickel resources in the Dominican Republic. Has the Minister carried out any discussions or negotiations with the two largest mining companies to determine their future in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, from time to time we have many members of this government have had opportunity on occasion to meet with senior officials of both of those companies. I am sure in view of the fact of their large investment in this province that they intend to carry on that production here.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the - I direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Health and Social Development. Has he had any time or occasion to study the report submitted by the Association for the Mentally Retarded West Interlake Branch, with respect to the problem children in that area?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable Member for Lakeside is making reference to a brief that was presented today, no. I haven't read that brief. I've been presented with other briefs that deal with this type of problem across the province and I've had the opportunity to look at those needs. But I will be looking and referring this brief to officials of my department, and certainly if a policy decision is needed by my department such a policy direction will be referred to my colleagues in Cabinet.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary. It wasn't my intention to cause the Minister any concern. My dating of this brief was May 15th and I thought perhaps he had had it

(MR. ENNS cont'd) earlier. Would he undertake to study the specific situation in the community of St. Laurent, and particularly with respect to some of the expenses in the terms of the organizational work that has been done by individual people in that community in this regard.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the study will certainly be taken so far as the brief is presented of St. Laurent and surrounding areas.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. Could he indicate to the House whether it's true that the success or failure of Omnitheatre depends on the passage of Bill 70.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would mind calling Bill No. 81 and the amendment thereto.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Labour and the amendment thereto. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, on Saturday morning the Honourable Member for Fort Garry proposed a motion which in effect would kill Bill 81. However, before I proceed with my remarks on Bill 81 and the suggestion of the killing of Bill 81, I would like to announce to the House that one of the groups of employees within the Province of Manitoba who have right to strike under present legislation said a group of employees who may - I hope the Leader of the Opposition will stay just for a little while, because he's been ducking this resolution for so long. But anyway, Mr. Speaker, what I would like to suggest to honourable members, that one of the groups of employees in an essential service namely hospital workers and in particular - and I'm sure my friend the Member for West Brandon will be appreciative of this, that that group of employees who have the right to strike under our present legislation, the hospital workers at Brandon Hospital and Brandon General Hospital have reached agreement as to their next collective agreement. The reason I am saying this and informing the House, Mr. Speaker, that fears have been exhibited that under Bill 81, where we give to employees the right to strike, we may abrogate the situation prevailing under the present Act with employees and employers in so-called essential services. And I would like --(Interjection)-- what about next year, my honourable friend from Lakeside says, Mr. Speaker, it indicates to me, and as I'm sure that it must to the other members of the House, his absolute ignorance of the present Labour Relations Act and the intent of Bill 81.

So I want the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, and in particular the Member for Brandon West, to know that notwithstanding the right to strike of the hospital workers under present legislation, there has been a resolution of that dispute as a result of the conciliation efforts of the Department of Labour which will be available, Mr. Speaker, under Bill 81 as well, I'm sure honourable members of the House will be happy to know that without compulsory arbitration in essential services such as the services being provided to Brandon General Hospital, there will be no strike. I would also like to say again to the House, a similar situation prevails insofar as the Winnipeg General Hospital is concerned, and that a resolution of the dispute between the hospital workers at the Winnipeg General Hospital and management at Winnipeg General Hospital was resolved without the requirements of compulsory binding arbitration as is suggested by the Conservative Party of Manitoba - that where people of goodwill, management and labour are determined to resolve their differences, we don't have to resort to compulsion by a third party namely, government. And I was so happy and so pleased over the weekend, Mr. Speaker, --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. PAULLEY: I think the rules of the House compel you to keep quiet while I'm on my feet, and I only wish you would adhere to them - I doubt whether you would, being the type of individual that you are.

But I was so pleased over the weekend, Mr. Speaker, I was so pleased over the weekend to hear another Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker - not a New Democrat, but to hear the Minister of Labour of the Federal Government join - of course there's no difference if one has principles. But my honourable friend from Lakeside who may not have those principles can

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) very well turn around and say, well what is the difference. And I can appreciate again, Mr. Speaker, such utterances coming from the Honourable Member for Lakeside, and he may not have the principles that even the Minister of Labour of the federal authority which I understand is a Liberal jurisdiction Martin O'Connell publicly said in effect that he agrees with the contention of the New Democrat Minister of Labour in the Province of Manitoba, that he too does not believe in compulsory binding arbitration in industrial disputes. I don't know whether this has penetrated the mind of the Member for Lakeside, but I do trust that it may eventually even rub off to some of the members of the Conservative Party. -- (Interjection)-- No I'm not compelling, you can leave, you can leave. I say, Mr. Speaker, I say to the Honourable Member for Lakeside he can leave, and he'll be just as effective outside of the House as he is within it. So it doesn't matter a continental really, Mr. Speaker, as far as his contribution to debates are concerned, whether he makes them outside or inside of this House. So if my honourable friend wants to take his leave let him so do.

When I was speaking on Saturday morning in replying to the motion proposed by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, I said that at that particular time his motion meant in effect, and in accordance with parliamentary procedures, that the people of Manitoba and outside of Manitoba who are interested in Bill 81 would be deprived of their democratic rights to be heard. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry at that particular time interjected time after time and said this is not so. What a change, Mr. Speaker, has taken place over the weekend. The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, the Member for River Heights has gone on the air; the Honourable the Member for Fort Garry has also gone on the air and said, we don't mean this at all, we're only trying to delay the passage of the bill in order to give an opportunity to people to be heard. Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether they have any confidence in the Minister of Labour or in this government, because from time after time I have said publicly and I have also said in this House that an opportunity will be given to the people concerned to be heard in the Committee of Industrial Relations or Law Amendments Committee when this bill is referred. To me, Mr. Speaker, it's a bunch of utter nonsense for the Leader of the Opposition or his cohort the Member for Fort Garry to say otherwise, and that the motion that we are considering at the present time only means delay in order that the people may consider Bill 81.

The Honourable Member for Rhineland, and I don't fault him for it, raised one or two questions in his deliberations on Saturday morning on the Christian approach to Bill 81. I don't know, Mr. Speaker, whether I'm a Christian or whether I'm not. I don't know whether Anglicans are considered within this ambit of being Christians. I make no hesitation, and I affirm that I am an Anglican and I believe myself to be a Christian. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I did attend my local parish church yesterday morning. It might be that I'm a hypocrite, I don't know. But I did attend, and while in attendance I looked at some of the scriptures, and I did afterwards. The Member for Rhineland referred to Corinthians, I referred to the establishment of a fellow called St. Joseph the Worker who was a carpenter, and I listened and I read the association of St. Joseph the Worker, a carpenter who in effect said, to go out into the world and unite and join together in our faith. Now I presume, Mr. Speaker, that there can be different interpretations of the scriptures. I prefer to think as the father, or at least the husband of the Virgin Mary, a Christian, as being a worker, and that he joined --(Interjection)-- oh well you wouldn't know, you only give lip service to it.

But, Mr. Speaker, when we want to quote the scriptures, and I want to say, and I appreciate very much the letters that I am receiving from people who say that it is against their Christian principles to have deductions of dues for the purposes of unions and their contributions into the welfare of some group of society. I want to say too, I have objections too of having to pay school taxes because my children have now grown up - they're not attending school. And if the same principle was applied in respect of school taxes, as was suggested by my honourable friend from Rhineland, how ridiculous and nonsensical would it be.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside in his dissertation the other day - and I must refer to it, Mr. Speaker - said that the basic principles involved in Bill 81 was payola to the trade union movement in Manitoba because they make contributions to the New Democratic Party. How low a mentality can anyone have to make such stupid utterances in this modern day; because if what my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, said was correct there'd be no doubt that the government of the Dominion of Canada would be a New Democratic government because of the influence of workers from Vancouver Island to Bona Vista. If what my honourable friend said was correct, Mr. Speaker, there'd be no question of doubt that the workers of Canada

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) would dominate governments, and that is the inference contained in the remarks of the Honourable Member for Lakeside Friday evening last.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate and I realize that there are differences of opinion, and I would yet like to hear from the Conservatives and their new-found ally the Social Credit Member for Rhineland, I would like to see any constructive criticism in respect to Bill 81 -- (Interjection)-- I'll get them? Mr. Speaker, the Member for Roblin says that I will get them. I wonder whether or not, in respect to the Honourable Member for Roblin whether he, who I imagine because of some of his utterances, is an employer of labour, whether he has allowed or would allow those who work and toil for him the opportunity of freely belonging to a trade union movement. I would ask the Member for Fort Garry, who is closely associated with a business journal in the Province of Manitoba, whether or not Cambridge Press in Manitoba are unionized. I would ask the Honourable Leader of the Conservative Party whether the employees at the International Inn are unionized. --(Interjection)-- They're not? Of course they're not. I would ask him, I would ask many employers both inside of this House and outside of this House, to declare whether or not they have fired employees within their respective organizations because they dared indicate their desire to become members of a trade union. It has happened in the hotel industry. The net result, Mr. Speaker, is that insofar as the hotel industry in Manitoba, to their shame, that there is only one hotel in Manitoba, to my knowledge, that is unionized, and that's the Fort Garry Hotel under federal legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this is one of the reasons for Bill 81. We are criticized on this side of the House because we are suggesting the change of onus from the employee who may desire to be unionized, to take it out of that individual's hand, to place the responsibility for onus of proof of dismissal on management. I can understand the opposition of many of those who are immediately opposite me in this Assembly, and I challenge them, Mr. Speaker, I challenge them, Sir, to withdraw their motion to defeat this bill and allow the bill to go to committee in order that the rank and file of Manitoba can be heard. We're all being subjected to letters from the Builders Exchange, the Manufacturers Association and other allied groups, to delay, delay, delay - and of course I think this has been the basis of the amendment of the Member for Fort Garry; but I challenge the Conservative Party in this House to be fair, to be honest and to allow Bill 81 to pass immediately and as quickly as possible in order to give the average and ordinary citizen of the Province of Manitoba, the worker, and management too, an opportunity to appear before the committee to consider the various sections of this bill. I dare them to do it. I dare them to do it.

I can imagine the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek would not want this because it might affect him and his group. I want to know, I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, how many of those opposite who are involved in industrial relations as proprietors and management, have a union or an association of a union in their respective industries. I want to tell them, Mr. Speaker, that I am in the process of attempting to make an assessment and so far in every instance I've come up with a blank. No one, International Inn; no one Cambridge Press --(Interjection)-- I'm talking about you. Schreyer is prepared to allow this bill to go to . . . you're not. And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, to my honourable friend, I want to say to my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition, that rather than criticize or condemn, let him by example allow this bill to go to committee so people can be heard. --(Interjection)-- You what? You don't want it; you don't want it. Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Fort Garry says we want it, and yet he brings in a motion to kill the bill. Now, how stupid can he be, how stupid can the Leader of his Party be? Because this is the historic way to kill a bill. And yet, Mr. Speaker, over the weekend both of these honourable gentlemen say, "Dear Mr. Public, dear Mr. Public" - and I'm sure that they must have had the fingers of both hands together in prayer, that the public would not understand them - they said, "Dear Mr. Public, this isn't what we meant". I judge them on what they said, not what they meant. --(Interjection)-- Yes, you be careful too, Miss.

Mr. Speaker, you can't have it both ways. I say to the Conservative Opposition have guts enough, have guts enough to withdraw the killing of this bill; cut out your fool nonsense -- and that includes you, Mr. Lakeside -- cut out your fool nonsense --(Interjection)-- I beg your pardon? That's right. That's right. Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend for Lakeside is so correct. There's bad people in the world. And there are those that speak with forked tongues, and those are the people who are now members of the Conservative caucus in the Province of Manitoba. They speak, Mr. Speaker, with forked tongues, pious sanctimony of saying, "Ah

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) dear, no; we don't really mean to kill this bill at all. All we want is to give everybody an opportunity to be heard".

One of these days, Mr. Speaker, I hope, if he is around here long enough, that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, who I understand, although it's not been proven to my satisfaction, has a degree in law, I understand that he has, one of these days the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, if he's around long enough - and I doubt whether he will be - either because of his capacity of absorption, mentally or otherwise, I only trust and hope that he will realize the significance of the motion proposed by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry. And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, and I have a great affection for the Honourable Member for Fort Garry and I thought that he had enough experience down at the other place down there at Ottawa, that he would know the effect of the motion that he proposed in this House.

Mr. Speaker, this morning in Industrial Relations Committee we considered a bill dealing with Workmen's Compensation, and just prior to the committee adjourning after it considered Workmen's Compensation, one of the honourable members of the Conservative caucus asked me as the Minister of Labour when the next time the Industrial Relations Committee would meet. There's only one bill, Mr. Speaker, that is now before this House for the consideration of the Industrial Relations Committee, or, if in the wisdom of the House it's referred to another committee. That bill, Sir, is Bill 81. I could only reply to the spokesman at our committee from the Conservative Party this morning that I did not know if and when the Committee on Industrial Relations would meet again because of the motion that was proposed, the motion that we have before us sponsored by the Member for Fort Garry, which would kill Bill 81, and I suggested to that honourable member that he should go back to his caucus and say to them, "Let us reconsider our position in order to give the people of Manitoba, the people of Canada, an opportunity to hear the provisions of Bill 81." And on that happy note this morning the deliberations of the Industrial Relations Committee ended for the time being.

Now I don't know whether my honourable friend who spoke this morning at the Industrial Relations Committee has had an opportunity of speaking to the Leader of the Conservative Party or to the Member for Fort Garry; I don't know whether or not he's had an opportunity to try and edify the Leader of the Opposition who apparently is so inept insofar as procedures of the House may be concerned; but if he hasn't, Mr. Speaker, may I speak on his behalf, that he agreed I believe that Bill 81 should be processed and into committee to hear representations as to the contents.

Mr. Speaker, I have in this House, first when I introduced the motion for second reading, and secondly Saturday morning - and I want to reiterate this afternoon - I have given my personal pledge, and I'm sure that that pledge will be honoured by the First Minister and the Members of this Government, that anyone who wants to make representation in respect of 81 will be heard. So I say, Mr. Speaker, may I plead, if indeed it is necessary to plead, --(Interjection) -- Yes, let's be serious. I do want you to be serious my honourable friend from Charleswood. Far more serious than the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, far more serious than the Leader of the Conservative Party, who have said one thing inside of this House, Mr. Speaker, another thing outside. I want to be sincere, I want to be serious and I would like the Honourable Member for Charleswood to join the Honourable Member for Emerson in trying to bring about a little bit of reason and understanding as to parliamentary procedure within the ranks of the Conservative Party.

I know that there are sections contained within Bill 81 that are subject to much debate and possible amendment. They are not going to be considered, Mr. Speaker, if the motion of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry is adopted by this House. Sometimes I've had differences of opinion with members of the Liberal Party but I do think that in this instance at least they are acting as a responsible political party. They are not attempting as is the Conservative Party and its Leader to scuttle Bill 81 by sloughing it under a rug. We talk of industrial relations in the Province of Manitoba. Members of the Conservative Opposition say to me, well they have been harmonious. I agree with them, Mr. Speaker, but change can happen even in the Province of Manitoba, even with its present administration. All we are attempting to do, Mr. Speaker, in this Bill is to recognize that the approaches that have been made in industrial relations in British Columbia, in Quebec, in Saskatchewan - yes, indeed, Sir, in Sweden and Australia, have not met up to the challenges of today. And it's very fine, Mr. Speaker, simply to say that because we haven't had any difficulties in the Province of Manitoba that we'll retain things the way they are today, and I say that that is not good enough.

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd)

On a personal note, I have spent a life-time associated with the trade union movement, associated with Parliament and this Legislature, as Mayor, as School Trustee and a Member of this House. And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we can't leave things the way they are. But whether things are going to be left the way they are or whether they are not there are propositions contained within Bill 81 that I think are worthy of the consideration of all free men and women in the Province of Manitoba to give them the opportunity of being heard in the Industrial Relations Committee or some other committee of this House. I challenge, I challenge the Conservative Party of Manitoba to give these people an opportunity of being heard; I challenge the Conservative Party of Manitoba to allow Bill 81 to go to the Committee ... --(Interjection) -- I beg your pardon, I beg your pardon, would you repeat? --(Interjection)-- My friend says it didn't change Autopac. He is correct possibly, Mr. Speaker, but it did give the people of Manitoba an opportunity to be heard. And I'm sure my honourable friend from Sturgeon Creek, if he were but honest with himself, would agree that as a result of the actions of this government in respect of Autopac that more people daily are coming to agree that the propositions of this government were fair and reasonable and will not be changed by any successive government in Manitoba. And I say that, Mr. Speaker, in the light of the experience in the Province of Saskatchewan. When the Saskatchewan Government introduced Public Automobile Insurance back in '47 I believe it was, it was condemned and criticized by Liberals and Conservatives at that particular time. Since then the Liberal Party had the opportunity of abolishing it, they did not. And I say to my honourable friend from Sturgeon Creek, whether or not in its wisdom or otherwise the electors of Manitoba change this government to either a Conservative, a Liberal, remotely possible a Social Credit Government in the Province of Manitoba, I predict at 62 years of age that I am, that neither Conservative, Liberal or Social Credit will change the basic principles of Public Automobile Insurance in the Province of Manitoba. So I say to my honourable friends, we can't, we can't. The shoving under the rug of Bill 81 as proposed by the Member for Fort Garry will not achieve anything. Let's give the people --(Interjection) -- Well of course, of course, and my friend from Morris I don't think he knows a hell of a lot of other things either. But, Mr. Speaker, I want to say, let the people be heard in respect of labour relations in Manitoba. I'm convinced, I'm convinced that given the opportunity, as I am sure that they will be despite the approach of the Member for Fort Garry, give them the opportunity of being heard. Give them the opportunity of, as I illustrated a few moments ago, of saying that we reject the attitude of some industrial organizations, such as some sectors of the press, some sectors of the hotel industry; give them the opportunity without the punitive measures put on them in their right to be heard, in their right for free democratic bargaining. I'm not alone. I'm not alone in this, this government is not alone as I indicated a few moments ago, Mr. Speaker. Martin O'Connell, Minister of Labour in a Liberal regime in Canada supports the same basic principles as this government does.

I challenge you Mr. Leader of the Conservative Party to realize the error of the ways and the motion of your colleague from Fort Garry. Pass Bill 81 today for second reading. I guarantee, Mr. Speaker, that if Bill 81 is passed today to go to committee I will not call that committee for at least 48 hours in order that the zions of business --(Interjection)-- You disbelieve me? May I cross myself? May I cross myself? May I sign an affidavit, Mr. Speaker? May I sign an affidavit if that is the only way that the Honourable Member for Morris will believe me? I'm prepared to sign an affidavit, but I do think, Mr. Speaker, despite, despite what some of the opinions of members opposite from Morris or River Heights may happen to be of the Minister of Labour, I'll stake my whole political reputation, I'll stake my portfolio as a Cabinet Minister of this administration, that if I act unduly, with undue haste, I tender my resignation. --(Interjection)-- What is the rabble saying now? Now, Mr. Speaker, that I have placed my position on the line in respect of 81, I have given my pledge, I'll tender my resignation to the Honourable the First Minister of this government that if Bill 81 is passed today and a committee meeting is held within 48 hours he can accept my resignation; and not only can he accept my resignation as a Member of Cabinet, I will call and I will give my resignation to the electors of Transcona who have supported me for over 25 years - and who believe in my sincerity even though the Member for Morris does not. And it is on that basis, Mr. Speaker, that I end up my contribution in reply to the motion introduced by the Member for Fort Garry. It is false, he knows that it was false when he considers that it was only a delaying tactic. Surely to goodness a man who has had such vast experiences as he presumes that he has had in the political

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) arena, knows damn fine that a motion for six months hoist effectively kills a bill. So I say to the Conservative Party, vote against your resolution, allow 81 to go to committee to allow the ordinary people to be heard.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour has put his job on the line and has offered to resign. If we can get this bill through in its present form. I think, Mr. Speaker, that if a bill of this type containing this kind of legislation ever does get through the Minister should resign.

Mr. Speaker, I was glad that the Minister did end on a somewhat quieter note than he began. I was getting the full force and thunder of his oratory directly opposite from him and I sat here thinking about the old chestnut about the southern politician who was asked to address a very difficult political audience and he was busy marking his notes up before he started and the Chairman was looking over his shoulder and he noted that every once in a while he was putting down the initials AWYLLH and the chairman finally couldn't contain his curiosity and he said "What does that mean?" "Oh, he said, I put that in every place, that means argument weak, yell like hell". I think the Minister was certainly yelling and I was not too impressed with his arguments at the time.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to deny the proclamation of the Minister on Saturday morning that we were trying to kill the bill by the motion of my colleague for a six months' hoist. What we have in mind, Mr. Speaker, is the example of the Federal Government in providing a white paper on difficult and far-reaching labour legislation to provide for an opportunity to study carefully, to get a reaction from across the land as to what improvements might be included in the actual bill. If this amendment of my colleague from Fort Garry is passed it will have the effect of making this bill into a draft, a white paper that can be used for the purpose of examination, of inviting remarks from all of the people who are concerned, and it concerns almost every part of our society.

So far from the position that the Minister takes that we're trying to kill the bill, we are trying to do exactly what the Minister thinks we're not trying to do, and that is to give the public an opportunity to look at this legislation very carefully. There is some good law involved in this bill; there are some excellent features in the bill; but there are some features of the bill, some principles involved that I can hardly understand how people who regard freedom with any great respect can support.

Mr. Speaker, it is important, it is vitally important to cause study and to allow adequate time for all segments of our society to look at this legislation, to admire its good features and to criticize its weaknesses; and we must insist that this time be given to everybody in Manitoba to come with their ideas, with their ideas for improvement and with the changes that they would propose. There isn't a great deal of hurry to put through a bill that will involve such far-reaching changes. I am sure that no amount of argument on the part of the Minister can convince the people of Manitoba that this needs to be handled in 48 hours or 72 hours or whatever. There have been many suggestions as to why this legislation was brought forward at this time, it's been suggested that the New Democratic Party owes a debt to the big unions and that there is need to come up with some legislation that will provide them with some reasonable return. I think, Mr. Speaker, many of the debaters on this bill have mentioned that over the last decade labour relations in Manitoba have been remarkably peaceful and with a minimum of problem and I think the reason for that is that the governments of the last decade have been sensitive and sympathetic to the needs of progressive legislation as it relates to the labour part of our economy. I think that has happened and, Mr. Speaker, this doesn't necessarily make the climate any better for the labour organizers, or the labour recruiters, because if they have a government in the Province of Manitoba that is anxious to bring forward progressive labour legislation the person who is receiving the benefits of that progressive legislation is inclined to place his favours in the hands of those that are enacting the legislation. So in effect when a government is sympathetic to labour and brings in good bills the problem of labour organization becomes more difficult and I think if this is the case, and I have no statistical evidence that it is, but I would suspect that in Manitoba it's just not the best spot to be recruiting members of a labour union. I am told there is a bargaining process ongoing at the moment where the union intended to use as one of its principle gains for the employees some improvements in vacations with pay and during the process of this bargaining the NDP government of Manitoba has come out with a bill which does exactly what the union had hoped to get for its members. Now what happens to

(MR. MCGILL cont'd) the support of the union in that case, they're inclined to say, "well really we should be paying our dues I guess to the NDP Party rather than to the union because they're the people who are getting us the things that we want". So, Mr. Speaker, it's not hard to understand how it is important for the government to bring in a bill of this type which would provide labour union dues to the unions for every employee involved in a collective bargaining unit whether they support the idea or wish to belong to the union, and that to me is a very onerous and oppressive clause.

There is some merit of course, some logic here, the logical point taken by the union as well, why should any labouring person get a free ride? If the union is out there working for them and getting it new concessions at each contract, why should there be labourers involved in that unit who do not subscribe and who do not pay dues. This is an argument that has been made; but, Mr. Speaker, if that argument has much validity, is there not also an argument to say well the Government of Manitoba, the NDP Party, is really giving you more advantages than the union because we have more clout, more wallop, we can get things through in legislation. Wouldn't it be reasonable to suggest that from every payroll employee in Manitoba we have a check-off for NDP Party dues. The same arguments would certainly apply here that if they're getting a free ride on the legislation that you're passing to extend their vacations, and there's some good legislation, we've supported it, if you're doing that for the working people, why should they get a free ride? Well it's just a step from the compulsory check-off of union dues to the compulsory check-off of party dues.

Mr. Speaker, I don't propose to deal with the good features of this bill; I don't think it's the real function of an Opposition to reinforce the desirable features even though in not mentioning them I will have to forego the plaudits of the Attorney-General who really likes to see some applause for the good features, and is inclined to think that when this is eliminated for reasons of time or brevity that somehow the Opposition is not being positive. I don't think that the Opposition's function is to point out all of the good features, and we admit that there are a number of them and I've had big business look at it and say, this is good, this is a desirable feature, on certain parts of this bill. But these will be part of the total result and the points which I wish to make in the short time that's available are on the features of the bill which I feel are unacceptable.

I would like to first comment briefly on the subject of technological change and the effort that is being made here to provide some rigid definitions of what constitutes technological change in industry and what lead time is going to be required to be given by management and business and industry to collective bargaining units before such technological changes are introduced. I question whether this can be really done in a way that will be useful to both management and labour. I really think it's a very difficult thing to include in legislation, even though we're aware that other jurisdictions are looking at this feature, and even though we're aware that there should be some responsibility on the part of industry for labouring people who are displaced by reason of technological change. But the definitions as I read it in the bill certainly don't indicate that there necessarily needs to be a displacement of workers if there is a technological change - it still will require a 90-day notice and lead time to be given before industry can do this. I'd like to cite an example of a rubber company in Ontario that has a distinct competitive advantage and is conducting a profitable business because they happen to be able to produce hydraulic hose in a longer length than any other company can produce, so they are employing 300 employees and they are making profits and they are able to provide their employees with good wages because they are profitable, because they are conducting an efficient and competitive business. Now in order to achieve that they introduced a machine which enabled them to produce a longer length of hydraulic hose but the other competitors in the industry didn't know that they were doing this. This machine actually reduced the labour force on the machine from four people to two but the other 300 people were very much better off and the other two employees were retrained for other positions. Now if this law were in effect at that time - had been in effect - they would have had to give notice to everybody concerned of this technological change which they proposed, and I think that the members opposite can realize that this would have perhaps destroyed any competitive advantage they might have had, and might have endangered the jobs of 300 other people who were involved in that industry. I suppose that if you interpret this definition that if the manufacturer, or the office of the manufacturer, wanted to replace his typewriters with electrical typewriters he would perhaps have to give 90 days notice even though no employees were in any way affected and even though the well-being and working

(MR. MCGILL cont'd) conditions of the employees were improved. Such 90 day notice might have to be given.

And one final example I would like to suggest, Mr. Speaker is that of Simplot Chemical in Brandon who were having trouble with their process, who were aware that the major part of that trouble was in the sulphur which came to them as part of the natural gas that they were getting from the gas supplier. They considered this problem for about six months; they were operating inefficiently; they knew that some way or other they had to get rid of that sulphur, and they decided on the purchase of a sulphur guard which was bought, installed, and has since produced to an amazingly good result on their quality of their production. It has reduced their lab costs. It has reduced their maintenance costs. Now the results are excellent; there is no challenge in any way to the number of employees, or to the working conditions; there is no change in the number of employees in the plant so far as I am aware, but their competitive position has been much improved, and their whole process has been improved because of the removal of a serious effect on the catalysts used in that industry by the sulphur coming in in natural gas. So here was a technological change which might have been delayed three months under the terms of this bill - no employees affected, but the cost of operating that business would have been seriously affected for three more months had they not taken this point.

Technological change after all, Mr. Speaker, is the basis of all improvements and perhaps it can be argued that all those who support the philosophy of a better quality of life in Manitoba are relying largely on technological change to produce it. We're all hoping that there be more leisure time in the future. We're all hoping that technological change can come about as rapidly as possible in industry to produce a competitive advantage to make it more profitable, to make it necessary for labour to work fewer hours at higher rates of pay. So if you are supporting a better quality of life, I suggest to you that you do not wish to provide any deterrent to technological progress. I suggest that you are doing this when you insist that industry consider very seriously any technological change that they might have in mind and at least wait 90 days before doing so. I think there's a tendency with a piece of legislation like that for industry to say, "well the status quo is what we want". We are in fact enshrining again mediocrity in our system by saying, let's keep it as it is and only in the case of a very important change are you going to consider doing anything to the process because it's a high technical thing when it relates to your collective bargaining agreement.

Mr. Speaker, if our economy needs anything, and I say we do need many changes but we need least of all any artificial restraints by means of legislation to technological improvement and change. In our desire and in our achievement of a better quality of life, a more leisure time, technological change is the major factor. Higher productivity, shorter working hours, higher pay, are all related to technological change. --(Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker, I would prefer if the First Minister would reserve his questions until I have completed my remarks.

I would like to comment just briefly on the clause which would provide that there would be compulsory check-off of union dues for all employees involved in an operation which has a collective bargaining agreement. I know there are many members on the opposite side who have said that they respect human rights and freedom to say what we like, to see what we like, and to hear what we like, and I am wondering how they rationalize a position of support of a bill which contains this clause with this fundamental support for human freedoms, and I would include with any human freedom list, the right to associate or to disassociate. There are not only those who disagree completely with this proposal on the grounds of religions principles but there are those who perhaps have no religion except that they regard their freedom in society as being of the basic and most vital importance to their own lives, and to ask them to accept by government statute a bill which would say to them if you are to work you must pay the dues to a union, or you cannot work. I think this is a most oppressive and onerous proposal and I cannot ever support a government or a party that would propose such a view.

The Honourable Member for Inkster who is not in his seat frequently tells us of his principles. He has said, and I admit this in the beginning, Mr. Speaker, that he thinks this is not particularly good legislation, but he's going to vote for it because it's better than the present statute. Well I don't know how he comes to that rationalization because he did say that after listening to the former Premier of the province, Mr. Campbell, he had resolved any hang-ups he had on philosophical or in principle problems, and he says on Page 3682 of Hansard, "anything that is less restrictive, that is less restrictive, I will vote for, and I assure you, and anything that is more restrictive I will vote against". Anything that is more restrictive I will

(MR. MCGILL cont'd) vote against. Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable Member for Inkster can find it in his conscience to vote for this bill in its present form, I have lost a great deal of respect for his principles.

One other part of the bill which gives me a great deal of difficulty in accepting is that which would provide for sympathy strikes. It's sometimes called the hot cargo clause, and this would provide that employees would not in any way abrogate or go against a collective bargaining agreement which does not permit strikes; they could simply stop working if they considered that their employer was using material produced from a plant or from a company that was on strike. Now I ask you to consider what would happen say, for instance, in the Winnipeg Convention Centre if during the construction it was the decision of unions that the workers should not work because they were using plumbing material that came from a branch of a plant in Ontario that had another branch in the United States that happened to be on strike. I suggest that the possibilities of this clause are limitless and we have in federal legislation provided anti-combine laws against big business for joining in restraint of trade, or in restriction of the free flow of goods to market, and somehow artificially controlling price. Here we are attempting to build into labour legislation an ability for big unions to operate in a manner that would surpass, in my view, the ability of any combine in industry to tie up this economy. I think that the provision that would allow workers to simply stop working - it's not a strike, they're just not going to work; they're not going to handle the electrical equipment at Nelson River because it comes from, say, English Electric in England where they're having a work stoppage, so the generators or whatever it is they get from English Electric will not be installed at Kettle Rapids because the other plant is on strike. I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the government consider this very seriously before they embark upon a kind of legislation that would provide for this sort of power in the hands of big unions. We don't want it in the hands of big business; we don't want it in the hands of big unions.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I couldn't help but be impressed on Saturday morning when the Minister of Labour was thoughtful enough in his remarks to include a reading of an editorial from the Brandon Sun of some two weeks ago, and I sat there and he read it in somewhat hushed tones, and in almost a reverential way as he read out a rather favourable comment upon the Minister of Labour having introduced this new and progressive legislation. Mr. Speaker, I say he read it in a hushed voice and with reverence, and at times he paused eloquently and he looked across at me, and I thought in somewhat of a reproachful manner, and I rather felt, you know, that the natural modesty of the Minister of Labour was being strained in his having to read his own press notices and that I should have been reading them for him, because it was a difficult thing for him to do and he frequently, as he read through this remark, he read how well the Minister of Labour was performing his duties in introducing this legislation.

I did feel somewhat guilty as he looked across at me from time to time, and perhaps I've been a little too modest in not more frequently quoting the Brandon Sun in this Legislature so, since the Minister has set the pattern, I feel then somewhat less restrained and I am going to read an editorial from the Brandon Sun, Mr. Speaker, which dates on Friday, just two days ago or three. The editorial is entitled: "Time to Listen" and it says: "Manitoba Conservatives while not necessarily disputing every item of the government's proposed labour code package, have nevertheless insisted that it should be studied longer before it is enacted into law. They have a point. In many areas the government is venturing on to new ground. Several provisions of the labour code are untested and could usefully be thought about for a bit longer. Understandably Premier Schreyer wants to wind up the current legislative session. Equally understandably, he wants the labour legislation passed before the session ends. But the suggestion that the bills be studied between sessions and then acted on in the fall makes sense. It is the kind of legislation the people should have a chance to study and discuss, and the government should give itself time to listen."

Mr. Speaker, the government should give itself time to listen. We have presented an amendment which would provide this legislation as a draft proposal for legislation which is to be produced at the next session. It has many good features. We don't want to lose them but we do want to review those features which we have mentioned, in a very critical way, as being unacceptable in our view, and we ask, Mr. Speaker, for the support of this House in having this bill held for future study.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion before the House. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I rise and I'm happy that the Minister of Labour is present

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) because my remarks to a large extent are going to be addressed directly to him.

Mr. Speaker, I've been in this House for six years. I've had the opportunity to watch the performance of the Minister of Labour as the Leader of the New Democratic Party in opposition. I have been entertained as others have been over the years by his demeanour, his manner of presentation, and the constant repetition of the words that he uses in debates, such as intestinal fortitude, poppycock, and so forth. But, Mr. Speaker, we have witnessed in the performance of the Minister of Labour, a performance that would indicate either a mind that has now become unbalanced, or a psychopathic tendency on his part, and Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the Honourable First Minister that one of the things that he should do when the session is completed is see to it that the Minister of Labour sees a psychiatrist.

Mr. Speaker, the performance of the Minister of Labour is equal in the best tradition of Joseph McCarthy ...

..... continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, my point of privilege here is that the Leader of the Opposition may feel that he's being quite, somehow quite cute, or quite smart in making that kind of a statement, but to suggest as he has that a particular member of this House should see a psychiatrist, if allowed, Sir, it can merely invite retaliation in kind and sometime later today I can, with just as much apparent seriousness, suggest that my honourable friend see a psychiatrist, and so the matter would be allowed to go until all members on both sides of the House are telling each other to see a psychiatrist. So I would suggest, Sir, that it's a matter that should not be allowed to pass lightly.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I would agree that there is merit in the point the Honourable First Minister puts forward. I do think we should address our remarks to the resolution before us, address them to the Chair and not directly at any member of the Assembly. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, before the First Minister interrupted I indicated that in my opinion the performance of the Minister of Labour was in the best tradition of Joseph McCarthy and Ron Gostick, and Mr. Speaker, I say that because I think when the Minister of Labour finished and said that he ended his contribution, he ended a regrettable performance.

There are differences of opinion with respect to this bill and I have indicated before in this House that I think there's an onus on the part of the government to prove its case, and I think that onus has to be discharged by legitimate debate and by legitimate presentation, and I do not believe that the Minister of Labour's performance is in any way a legitimate presentation. The attempt to become personal and to attempt to personalize as he did, only indicates the nature of the weakness of his argument, and as I indicated -- (Interjection) -- I'm doing it deliberately, and I'm doing it in answer to, I believe, a personal attack, deliberately planned, created by a mind that at this point has to be apparently unbalanced to justify it in this House, Mr. Speaker, and it's time, it's time it has to be said. We have suffered for the last few weeks as a result of the belligerency of the House Leader and I am not prepared to sit on this side and allow this to go unchallenged.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister of Labour mentioned a corporation in which there is a family interest, but he neglected, he neglected, Mr. Speaker, to mention the Premier's family interest and he neglected to apply the . . . to the Premier's interest, and the members opposite may have thought that that's a legitimate point insofar as debate, and they are going to be very happy at the fact that there is probably a bit of anger in my tone when I speak, and they think, well, the Honourable Minister of Labour has made some marks today. But I suggest what the Honourable Minister of Labour has done has not only lowered himself in the esteem of many members on the opposite side, but has also lowered the level of debate on this particular issue. And if you can take pride in that, then I don't think many of you are as worthy of our consideration as at least we've felt in the past.

Mr. Speaker, there is a difference of opinion with respect to the manner in how this bill is to be dealt with. We on this side have indicated that we want to consider it essentially as a White Paper to be given to the committee to be able to decide between this session and the next. We've indicated some areas of disagreement. We've indicated, and we're not the only ones who disagree on this in terms of a party position. The Honourable Member from Thompson has already suggested that, that there is such a thing in our opinion as a vital industry, and that that vital industry should be considered and should be defined, and we are open and listening to representations that will be made with respect to this specific issue to see how the bill could be amended to reflect what we consider to be a majority view in this province, a majority view, that vital industries should in fact be excluded from this act but at the same time with no intent to put those workers in the impossible position of working under what would be considered slave conditions, and again, I'm talking in terms of the remarks that the Honourable Member for Crescentwood has used in his presentation.

Mr. Speaker, our object would be to have the committee listen to people, and listen not only in Winnipeg but listen in the north, in Thompson, in Flin Flon, which went through a recent strike and which we're all aware of, in The Pas, in Gillam, in western Manitoba in the major cities, in the eastern part, in any of the other communities that the committee itself would decide, and our objective would be to listen to what people had to say and on the basis of that to be able to make a determination to improve the bill so that it could possibly result in the kind of a compromise that would accept the principle that the honourable members opposite

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) want and at the same time would give us an opportunity to develop something better than what is happening.

Now the government has the majority, Mr. Speaker; they can exercise any option they want. They can say, no, we're not prepared to do this. What we're prepared to do, what we're prepared to do, Mr. Speaker, is have it go to committee in 48 hours, have a couple of days' hearing whoever has been given notice by the government, of whoever has given notice to the government, who is ever aware of this, and then as a result of this we'll pass it on third reading. We do this with many other bills. But Mr. Speaker, you know, we're in a situation where there is an admission by the Honourable Minister of Labour that conditions of labour are reasonably good; in fact we have the best labour relations in Manitoba. So there is no hurry, there is no crisis, there is no particular situation which justifies immediate action, and I don't think there's anything wrong on our part in asking to listen to people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to go back to last year when we dealt with the right of policemen to strike, and when Art Coulter appeared for the Manitoba Federation of Labour and talked about that, and we said to him, "Why is it that no policemen had come before the committee? Why was it no policemen had come to support the position, or to even speak against it?" And now why was it that we are put in this position of having to determine a procedure whereby the right to strike would be given but it was acknowledged that that right would never be allowed to be exercised because we would have the authority to be able to stop it, and all we were doing essentially at that time was giving them for the purposes of collective bargaining the thought that they had the right to strike but in reality from one hand we were basically saying that they were not going to have the right to strike. And we asked, you know, in terms of a legitimate method of bargaining is this really required? Is this going to be better than what it was? And those questions were not really answered, Mr. Speaker. They weren't answered by him; and they weren't answered by any of the policemen who were involved. They were never there. Now, Mr. Speaker, surely it's not unreasonable to ask for us to be put into a position to hear from the employees who are involved, from the working people themselves involved in the various industries, their opinion. Surely we shouldn't be put in the position of not having that information and not being in a position to be able to make a judgment.

Now the reply would be, "Well, we are in a position that anybody who has any opinion can contact any member on that side or this side and give an opinion." And Mr. Speaker, we have been contacted as the honourable members opposite have, and I have some of the letters that have been sent the honourable members opposite by people who are interested. But we also know, Mr. Speaker, that in terms of the dissemination of news, of information on this bill, that have only been before the public realistically for three weeks, that a great deal is not understood by the majority of people in the province, by the majority of workers, and by the majority of employers, and the implications of it are severe enough to warrant that kind of study. This does not mean, Mr. Speaker, that we are (a) against the basic principle or against most of this act, but we are trying to bring a deal of sanity to a situation and some reasonableness, and Mr. Speaker, I resent very much the attempt on the part of the Minister of Labour to try and twist this in such a way, to try and indicate that what we are attempting to do is not provide that kind of reasonable examination of the bill, and what he has basically suggested, Mr. Speaker, is because we've used this method to essentially have the bill appear as a White Paper before the committee. Now Mr. Speaker, I must assure the Honourable Minister of Labour that not within 48 hours but within five minutes we'll pass a resolution saying that this bill goes as a White Paper immediately to a committee to study this matter between this session and the next session. Within five minutes we'll pass that. Now our approach, Mr. Speaker, by what we have done is to try to indicate an attempt on our part for study, for an examination, and for some realism to be exercised with respect to the bill itself.

Now the Honourable Member from Brandon West dealt with the question of technological change, and I think he presented it in a fairly reasonable way, and he brought a specific example about Simplot. But I don't think many members here were realistically aware of it -- I'm not even sure the Minister of Labour was aware of it. But that was an interesting situation, Mr. Speaker, because it affected directly the employment in Brandon; it affected the problems of pollution and the existing laws; and it affected labour and management relations. Mr. Speaker, Manitoba's industrial situation is such that we have to recognize that we are going to go through tremendous transformations in the next period of time; to be able to modernize our industrial capacity if we're going to be able to hold the jobs that we have, if we're going to be

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) able to become productive to be able to compete in the markets of the world. Because we are made up of so many small businesses who have over the years only had limited vision of their market potential, really restricted to Manitoba and to Western Canada, who never raised our sights beyond us until recently, we have many situations in which there are going to be tremendous technological changes that are going to have to occur if we're going to be able to have those smaller industries be able to invest in efficiency and be able to develop in the years to come. If they do not, they're not going to be able to maintain in Manitoba and the result is that they will be discontinued and there will be job losses.

Now, the way in which this should be arrived at, the manner in which technological change should be dealt with, the whole approach that must take place, is something that I think requires serious consideration. I'm one who believes that as between union and management they're probably in a better position to understand technological change than any of the members opposite are, particularly a union that's dealing in the particular area that knows the kinds of things that are happening and can understand the basic developments that occur. And I'm not sure, Mr. Speaker, at this point that in terms of the wording in the act itself with no real guideline or ability to define technological change, that we realistically are approaching it in a way that will provide both the basis on which this particular section should be applied. Mr. Speaker, these are the kinds of questions that I think have to be asked both of union and of management with respect to the kinds of approaches and the manner in which the particular clauses have to be dealt with.

So, Mr. Speaker, the honourable members opposite and the Honourable Minister of Labour may very well want to try and turn our basic approach as being one attempting to kill the bill. Let me say this, we do not want to kill the bill. We want consideration between this session and the next session. We will gladly withdraw the -- if we can and I guess we need unanimous consent -- we would gladly withdraw the six months' hoist, Mr. Speaker, if in fact there's an undertaking by the government that they will take it to a committee inbetween sessions. That's all we ask. We recognize the government has a majority on the committee; we recognize that the government has a majority in this House; we recognize that the government in our next session will have a majority as well and that they can put the act through. But all we're saying is that with some degree of sanity and reasonableness that there be a sufficient time for study and examination, and for that, Mr. Speaker, we do not have to be put in the position of the kinds of personal attacks that are made or, to be able to have to basically receive the kind of admonition that the Honourable Minister of Labour has given to us. And, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, -- (Interjection) -- I have nothing to say to you. Mr. Speaker, -- (Interjection) -- No I have really nothing to say to you . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. There is only one speaker on the floor at a time, and the speaker on the floor will address his remarks to the Chair, not to other members across the floor. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, the members on this side have presented in their various speeches different points of view with respect to different items of the act and I think they have raised questions that have to be answered. I don't think that they have been answered by the members opposite, and I don't think that there has really been an attempt to in fact answer them. Rather what has happened is there has been an attempt to allow the members on this side to exhaust their debate and then to use the majority to be able to push it into committee so that we can get finished with the session.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it's our opinion that the right course of action is the one that we propose. The government can reject it, so let them reject it, let them express the fact that they're rejecting it, and we'll accept that, but we don't have to go through the kind of play that we've gone through in the last little while. Politics sometimes can develop into situations in which not only the personalities of the people involved but the nature of the debate and the potential for an election issue becomes overriding to the point that we lose some sight of our objective here, and our objective here is not necessarily, you know, the immediate gain that can occur as a result of the thrust here or the thrust there, or the attacks that are made, but rather is to try and develop in our society legislation in legislative acts that will accomplish good and will in turn provide for an improvement in the quality of life in our society. And that is the dedicated aim of the Honourable First Minister and that's been our dedicated aim. And the fact that we oppose it at this particular time in the way that we do does not suggest that we believe in any way that what is being proposed in itself will necessarily, will necessarily be

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) detrimental although we have given our opinion of certain qualifications and certain concerns.

Mr. Speaker, there's been demonstration here by myself, and by others, that we are not aware of all the details of the act, that is of the previous act. I've indicated before that I do not in any way pretend to stand here as someone who's familiar with labour relations, but at the same time, Mr. Speaker, I'm satisfied as a result of some of the representations made in my presentation on Friday that there'll have to be an amendment introduced by the Honourable Minister of Labour to be able to accomplish the objective that was intended in the act, which came as the result of the clash in debate that occurred in our examination. And we've had too much representation made to us by people whose situations may not necessarily be correct but who nevertheless, we feel, warrant the ability of a legislative committee to hold the kind of hearings over a period of time that full examination can take place, that a real understanding could take place of where we stand and what is to be accomplished, before we are asked to pass into legislation something that is fairly fundamental with respect to labour relations in Canada and which will in the opinion of the Member from Crescentwood create a milestone. Well if it is, then that's something that he and many of the other members have worked on for a period of time. It's something that has come as a result of meetings that they've held, and the Honourable Member for Thompson indicated that, in the influences that they've had in the bill.

But nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, that has been in secret, and that's been in closed chambers, and that's been with the departmental people and whoever else has been invited into the inner sanctums of government, and there's nothing wrong in that, but all I'm saying, Mr. Speaker, is now that we have it exposed, and now that we're going to have it ventilated, at least have it ventilated in a way that there can be realistic understanding, presentation, and the contributions to be made throughout all areas of the province by all those who feel that they have something to say and in the course of this what we will produce ultimately has to be better than what we have now, and ultimately will probably be better than what we have in terms of legislation now. And if that, what I consider a reasonable presentation on our part, is to be twisted by the members opposite, or particularly the Minister of Labour, or is to be misunderstood, then I'm sorry for them, and I'm also sorry for the Minister of Labour.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Question on the motion. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal party.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, on the motion, it seems customary for members to stand before they enter into debate and outline their credentials, or the number of years that they've served in the House. My honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition begins his presentation by saying he's been here six years, the Minister before him 25 years. Mr. Speaker, I've only been in this Chamber for six days but I don't think one has to have longevity in these debates in order to have a point of view. Our point of view that we expressed before Bill 81 was introduced for second reading was that there are contained in Bill 81 conflicting principles. Many principles with which the Liberal party readily identifies and supports, and many principles with which it considers a controversial debate must take place, must take place to soften and to water down some of the rough edges. Nevertheless it seems apparent that the rules of this House, the niceties of this House, require that one can never come to grips with divergent principles and divergent aspects of a bill except in third reading in committee and in the clause by clause. And so while I agree with what my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition is saying in terms of public analysis, and I point to the fact that when Bill 81 was introduced and printed our statement at that time was that this required very broad public discussion and I would want to hear, as a member of this House, submissions from all interested groups, rank and file of labour, consumers groups, and so on. And I'm not at all satisfied, as I said at that time, that it can be done in a rushed way during the rush of the speed-up of the session. However, the only way we're going to find out is to put it into committee and if it turns out that in committee we are in a marathon and do not have the opportunity for the submissions that we consider our responsibility dictates that we receive, or if we feel that at that point we have failed to persuade the government to accept the amendments that I think are necessary, and some of which I referred in my presentation on Bill 81, then I say to my honourable colleagues on this side of the House that the opportunity then is available to them and us to ask for what we're asking in the sub-motion before us. And it's for that reason, Mr. Speaker, that I am prepared to see Bill 81 now advance to committee. Not because I approve it in principle but because I approve enough of its principles -- (Interjection) -- entirely. Because enough of

(MR. ASPER cont'd) its principles are acceptable that there's no way one could vote on this bill in principle because there are valid principles and there are questionable principles. So the only way that we are going to be able to come to grips with our differences is to put this into a clause by clause. I will restate that in observing this debate, and there have been moments of considerable disappointment to me, we stated in our initial presentation that for example the 35 percent vote was a good thing, it was part of Liberal policy, but that the bill suggested that there could take place certification votes below 35 percent down to one and two percent. And the Member for Inkster proudly say yes, that's what's intended. -- (Interjection)--

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Inkster on a point of privilege.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. At no time did I say that there should be a certification vote if less than 35 percent of the people asked for such a vote. Mr. Speaker, at no time did I make that statement. And I don't agree that it should.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: I'm afraid, Mr. Speaker, that Hansard for Mr. Green's presentation has not been printed and so that we can't determine but certainly I received the impression that when I said . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please. Order. I think one of the House rules, and it's also in Beauchesne to which I would refer the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, that when an honourable member stands in his place in this House, and also in the House of Commons, or any House in the British Commonwealth of Nations, and states that this is what he said the honourable member has to accept it. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, I wasn't quarrelling with my honourable friend. The impression conveyed to me may have been wrong and I certainly accept his statement that he does not. Under those circumstances therefore he will undoubtedly support the amendment that we'll bring forward to make categorically certain that certification votes will not occur below the 35 percent level. Because the bill requires the amendment.

It may very well be, it may very well be that as a result of the presentations we've made on this side of the Chamber that the Minister of Labour will bring in amendments which make the bill far more palatable.

We raised the issue of the right to strike, the right to lockout during automation through technological change. And we applauded at that point the fact that at least there would be binding arbitration on the one issue of whether or not a significant automation, technological change had occurred. But we will still in committee debate very strongly as to whether or not the Minister has found the correct solution in allowing strikes and lockouts to take place.

The automatic check-off, again loudly debated in this Chamber. Our commitment is to implement the Rand Formula but we ask the Minister in committee, where this appropriately should be done, to bring in the amendment that permits me to vote for this bill, and that is that no person who is affected by conscience, or religious conviction, or political conviction, be forced to contribute if he is not a member of the union. And we will look for an amendment in that respect. -- (Interjection) -- When I'm completed. And so, Mr. Speaker -- (Interjection) -- Good. The areas that we still face in controversy, compulsory conciliation, we say let us hear from rank and file, let us hear from the consumers groups, let us hear from the real public, not the bosses of business and not the bosses of labour but the real public, and let us have a thorough hearing from people on the question of essential services because when we reform our labour code, admittedly the Minister is correct when he says this does not extend the right to essential services strikes, it merely doesn't prohibit them, and we say that at a time when we are reviewing our whole concept of labour-management relations that it was an appropriate time to consider this issue. But it isn't . . . to our debate today that we don't have legislation prohibiting the right to strike in essential services. The Minister has indicated I hope that he'll be willing to consider those amendments in the clause by clause study at committee.

The question of hot goods, secondary boycotts, sympathy strikes, we could go on for years as labour and management have gone on, tearing at each others' throats over these issues. The appropriate place to do it now regardless of our separate points of view on this issue is in committee.

I raised my own disappointment that the bill contained no command, demand for democratization, a labour bill of right that I had asked for, and the Canadianization of the unions.

(MR. ASPER cont'd) And in this regard I must say, Mr. Speaker, we were disappointed in the quality of response we received primarily from the Honourable Member from Inkster who took advantage of the opportunity to put on one of his command performances posturing, parading, eyes bulging, lips quivering with rage, nostrils dilated, to tell us that as he sat up each straw dragon and then demolished them -- the Don Quixote of the government benches has scored again. And so we choose not to respond to the demagoguery, the characterization of anyone who dare to challenge these tablets of stone as being the puppet, the voice of industry, the enemy of the little man, that was the essence of his contribution. And so, Mr. Speaker, we say to the members of government that despite our difference and despite our disappointment in the manner in which our arguments have been dealt with, we will take the Minister of Labour at his word, we will go to committee, and we will determine whether or not the Honourable Leader of the Oppositions charges of insincerity are true or untrue, and I suspect that we will come out of committee knowing whether we're going for a hoist or for speedy passage on third reading with amendment. And I urge the Minister of Labour to open his mind to our suggestions. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster. The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance)(St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, the honourable member agreed, I believe he agreed to answer a question that I had. He was dealing with the rights of individuals to opt out from paying their dues and I'm wondering whether he would apply the same sort of reasoning to members of his own profession and that of say the College of Physicians and Surgeons?

MR. ASPER: The analogy, Mr. Speaker, does not hold. The bill before us requires the non-unionized membership to contribute to union costs. The Law Society does not act as a collective bargainer nor does the medical profession nor does the Teachers' Association. -- (Interjection) -- No, no. One of the honourable members opposite says, they set rates. That's not the case, they set minimum standards and minimum rates but the final choice on rates is up to the courts of Manitoba not the Law Society of Manitoba, never. The whole theory of taxing of lawyers' bills is based on the fact that no group without recourse to the courts will settle their own fees. The record of taxing in this province of lawyers' bills goes against the Law Society tariff, not in favour. But the more important aspect of the question, and the answer that it deserves, is that the Law Society does not contribute money to political parties, unions are free to do that, and therefore the non-member should certainly be able to say to his conscience I am prepared to contribute to the cost of collective bargaining but beyond that, no. Our only exception, as I made in my major presentation, was that the non-unionized member who is on the Rand check-off should have the right to deduct an amount equivalent to his pro rata share of that amount which the union contributes to a political cause with which he's not in sympathy - Liberal, Conservative, New Democrat - and the nub of that point, most important, is that there are people in this city, and in this province, and in this country, who for conscientious religious convictions cannot in fidelity to their beliefs contribute funds to a labour organization. And Ontario has faced it, and Saskatchewan has faced it, and both have said under those circumstances we will let you opt out of the contribution provided you make a contribution of an equivalent amount to a charity. -- (Interjection) -- I'm under the impression that Saskatchewan has an exception clause. Am I wrong? -- (Interjection) -- I'm prepared to see you in committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I rise principally to participate in this debate because of certain misunderstandings that appear to have arisen with regard to my particular position, I indicated, Mr. Speaker, at the outset in referring to the Minister of Labour's bill that that is not my type of legislation, that essentially I do not believe in passing legislation which particularly affect trade unionists and particularly affects employers, that I believe that the law as it relates to other people in our society should relate to employers and employees, and that I believe given the freedom of association which is available to everybody and the freedom of what one is able to do by virtue of that association, that the rights of the employees in our society and the rights of management in our society would be best protected. And, Mr. Speaker, on that point I would indicate that that kind of freedom is not generally associated with legislation creating a particular group and saying that they can handle that group, set the fees that are prescribed by that group, set the terms and conditions under which a person could be a member

(MR. GREEN cont'd)of that group. And in that respect, Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the Member for Wolseley who says that it is not a good comparison to refer to the Law Society or the Medical Association, the College of Physicians and Surgeons, or the Dental Association, that it is not a good analogy to say that if I wish to be a member of that society I would not have the right to designate my dues because of my religious conviction, that I would not have the right to designate my dues to go to a charity of my choice rather than go to the Law Society. The Leader of the Liberal Party said that this is not a good analogy because the Law Society has been created by statute, that that statute says that only members of the Law Society can practice law; that it says that those people shall pay their dues to a law society, and that the Law Society then does not engage in collective bargaining. Well, Mr. Speaker, if the Legislature stood here and passed a law saying that the United Steelworkers Union of America shall be the governing body with regard to steelworkers; that those steelworkers would have to become a member of that association and pay their fees to that association; that the steelworkers could set the terms and condition upon which people could be members of the steelworkers association, and nobody else could practice the trade of doing what one does when one is a steelworker, they would not engage in collective bargaining either. There would be no collective bargaining, Mr. Speaker, just as it is with the Law Society, just as it is with the College of Physicians and Surgeons, who do not have to engage in collective bargaining, because collective bargaining is engaged in only for the reason of advancing one's condition of employment on the basis that nobody else will be able to undercut those conditions, and if the Legislature of Manitoba said that they would do for the steelworkers, or do for the plumbers, or do for the carpenters, what they have done for the medical profession and the legal profession, Mr. Speaker, then there would be no need for these organizations to engage in collective bargaining.

The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party included the teachers, and said that they don't engage in collective bargaining. Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know -- my firm acted for the teachers for many many years, and we engaged, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of that group in collective bargaining with the various school divisions. Mr. Speaker, we engaged in collective bargaining, that is what the Teachers' Association does, so when the honourable member says that the teachers do not engage in collective bargaining, he's just not right, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: My question to the Member from Inkster is: Does the Law Society of Manitoba set the fees for the lawyers in your submission, is that what you're saying?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, it is essentially the case that the tariff of legal fees is one that is recommended and agreed to by the members of the profession, then requested that be turned into regulation approved of by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. If you will give the steelworkers the same privileges, I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that they will not be asking for Bill 81, they won't need Bill 81. If you are going to put into legislation a **privilege for the steelworkers** equivalent to that now enjoyed by the Honourable Member for Wolseley and myself - and I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that that particular privilege has done pretty good for our terms and conditions of employment, we have done well by it. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party has done well by it, and I have done well by it, and I really have no complaint about it. But for him to suggest that the steelworkers are in a better position or in a more favourable position is not correct.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: . . . the privilege of the House. The Honourable Member has misinformed as to fact the House. The fact stated by the Honourable Member from Inkster is that the Law Society sets the fees for the lawyers and that's what they charge.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. GREEN: I didn't say that, I said that they recommended . . .

MR. ASPER: . . . and they become regulation by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the tariff in the Queen's Bench Act is approved of by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. If he is referring to the other tariff, the Law Society tariff, which does not relate to work that is done in court, that is not approved by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, that is approved of by the profession itself.

MR. ASPER: The fact which is misstated is that the Manitoba Bar Association recommends a tariff. No lawyer is required to belong to the Manitoba Bar Association nor pay dues to it, it's a voluntary association.

MR. GREEN: I don't think that that undoes what I have said. I have said that the lawyers

(MR. GREEN cont'd) themselves recommend the type of tariff that is to be followed. In the case of that tariff as it relates to court fees, it is approved by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council; insofar as that tariff relates to other fees, it is the Law Society, Mr. Speaker, not the Bar Association which essentially sees to it that that tariff is in some way respected, and what I said the other night that in Ontario it is considered, Mr. Speaker, and has been considered, a breach of ethics for which one can receive the discipline of the society for a person to charge less than that tariff. I don't know whether that really enters into the argument. What I have -- (Interjection) -- Well the honourable member brought it up. He said, Mr. Speaker, that the teachers do not bargain collectively; that the lawyers are in a different position because they have a statute which creates them, and which thereby gives them the right to not bargain collectively because they have gotten together and without collective bargaining and with the statutory rule which keeps people out of practising their profession, they don't have to do what the steelworkers and the plumbers, or anybody else has to do, and that is to go and win recognition for people being part of their profession. Mr. Speaker, I really didn't intend to deal with the statements of the Leader of the Liberal Party who -- (Interjection) -- Yes, I know, who said that I pontificated as he stood there pontificating with his hands in his pockets and his chin in the air, that I built dragons and then slew them. Mr. Speaker, they weren't my dragons, they were his dragons. I could not build such weak dragons as he built. I couldn't imagine the kind of thing being presented as argument as what the Leader of the Liberal Party suggested. But the interesting thing, Mr. Speaker, is that he said that what I said about his submission was full of inaccuracies. Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Liberal Party would like to come in and show that he has demolished a position. He would like to come in, I'm sure, I mean every person would like to say that this particular position was presented and I would like to show that nothing came of it. And I think that he would particularly like to do that in view of the exchange that took place the other night with regard to the position that he presented and the challenges that I made with regard to that position. He got up at one point and said that it was full of inaccuracies. Mr. Speaker, if that were correct, would the Leader of the Liberal Party have got up today and enjoyed, not enjoyed, the privilege, Mr. Speaker, and the luxury of showing all of the inaccuracies which were contained in my address and which he is now able to show as being an accuracy. Mr. Speaker, if those inaccuracies were there that's what he would have done, but instead of doing that he got up and said that the Member for Inkster put on a command performance and he pursed his lips and he pontificated, and all kinds of things of that nature. But, Mr. Speaker, what was said that was inaccurate? The only thing that was said that was inaccurate, and which I could deal with for another hour and which I've made two pages of notes on, are what was said by the Member for Wolseley. His dragons, which I believe were slain, but they were not my dragons, they were dragons which he threw out in an effort I suppose to demonstrate a death wish with regard to this particular argument because I took those inaccuracies and I dealt with them, and I welcome, Mr. Speaker, not I welcome -- I know that if I speak and make inaccurate statements, that they can be challenged in the House, and I wish that the Honourable Member for Wolseley would have showed me what I said that was inaccurate.

But that's not what I intended to deal with, I intended to deal with the particular position with regard to labour relations. Mr. Speaker, there is a text book on labour relations which is given to the students of the Law School of the University of Manitoba and I'm rather proud although maybe the reference would be considered by others as not something to be proud of, but within that textbook there is a third view of labour relations and the excerpt that is taken to demonstrate that third view is a speech that was made in 1966 by myself - it was the winter of 1967 - by myself when I was sitting as the Member for Inkster in the Opposition and during which time I made numerous addresses concerning labour relations. And one of the references that is taken out of that book says, "that the one side of the question has continually pushed labour laws for the purpose of trying to reinforce the position of the employer, another side has pushed labour laws to try to reinforce the position of the employees, and the Member of the Legislative Assembly for the Constituency of Inkster says that the best way of not assisting either side would be to remove the particular laws altogether and let the parties exist under the same laws as govern other people. And that this was an approach which would not be accepted by management, and which would not be accepted by the trade union movement, and would likely not be accepted by a group of legislators." And, Mr. Speaker, that is an accurate position with regard to my approach. I'm sure that it would not be accepted by management; I know that

(MR. GREEN cont'd) it is not accepted by the trade union movement, and I don't think that there would be a legislature today that would pass legislation implementing that approach, although I believe, you know, I have sufficient sort of immodesty to think that eventually that is the way employer-employee relations would go.

But my position with regard to labour relations is very much the same as it was with regard to censorship. I believe that freedom of the parties would be the best form of laws with regard to labour relations, and the Member for Sturgeon Creek is nodding his head and the Member for Fort Garry seems to agree. I want them, Mr. Speaker, I want them to know what this involves because in the United Kingdom until very recently, in England until very recently there were no laws with respect to union recognition. There is no such thing as a certificate, nobody gets certified. They go into the employer's place of business and they say to the employer, "We now represent your employees". And the employer said, "No you don't". And if they don't get together and start talking, you know within a very short period of time whether the union does or does not represent those employees, because if there is no discussions between the union and the employer, and the union believes it represents the employees, it says, by voting by its feet that we will not work until you recognize our representative. And the fact is, Mr. Speaker, if they've got the vote, so to speak, no more work occurs until the employer recognizes the employees. And, Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned that is better than any certificate that is ever granted by any labour board. And the fact is that if you have strength of the employees behind you, you don't need the certificate, and if you don't have the strength of the employees behind you then the certificate doesn't do you a damn bit of good because, Mr. Speaker, I have represented unions that have held certificate for years and years but have never been able to consummate a collective agreement because the certificate was obtained on the strength of somebody saying I want to be a member of the trade union and I hope that the trade union organizer will be able to get me a collective agreement and when the trade union organizer comes back and says, look if we're to get a collective agreement, we're going to have to exert our united action for the purpose of getting it, the employees think twice about it, and in fact they wonder whether they were convinced to join a trade union on the proper basis. So I have said, Mr. Speaker, and it has not been accepted by trade unions, that it has not been accepted by management, and would not be accepted by those who so loudly scream for freedom and if they want to test me, they can make a motion that we discontinue certifying trade unions, that there be no inhibition on the right of a workingman to withdraw his services at any time, at any time. Now think about what that means because that reinstates recognition strikes. It means that from then on there would be no law which said that a union had to go to the labour board and apply for certification. It would mean that there would be no law which says that if an employee is dismissed for what his fellow employees - never mind courts or magistrates or labour boards - that if his fellow employees feel that he has been dismissed because of union activities, they would have a right to walk outside of that plant and say, we will not work until this man is reinstated. Mr. Speaker, think about what that means because to me that is better protection than the courts, the labour boards or the reverse onus which is being instituted for prosecution. That is more important. What does it mean to union shops? Do you know what it means, Mr. Speaker? In England they don't legislate union shops and they have it in very few agreements as I understand. But what they do, Mr. Speaker -- and think about it, the Member for Fort Garry, see whether you believe in this type of freedom -- that I, as a union steward have the right to walk in in the afternoon to the employer and say the man at that bench has not paid his union dues. If he is here this afternoon he will be the only one here. That is how they have union shops in a country that believes in free collective bargaining; and it works more effectively than the legislation that will be now moved by the Minister of Labour. So think about what you are talking about when you say that you are interested in free collective bargaining, freedom of choice for the individual; my freedom of choice to say that I will or will not work with somebody who is a member of a trade union and my right to say that I won't work with someone who is not a member of a trade union and convince all of my fellow workers to do likewise. Is that a freedom? Do I have the right to say that? Because if I do have the right to say that then all of those statements on the other side of the House who say that this particular legislation is restrictive imply the opposite and, Mr. Speaker, I for one -- You know I can't back away from this position. I've been a lecturer in the law school for the last five years where I have articulated this kind of labour relations; I have been quoted throughout this country as believing in this type of labour relations, but it doesn't involve what the Member for Sturgeon Creek, what the Member for Fort Garry or what all of the other members

(MR. GREEN cont'd) who merely want to make the restrictions one-sided; it doesn't involve what they say.

If you say that you want the Minister of Labour to introduce a law which says that a person doesn't have to belong to a trade union by legislation - a legislated union shop where there is a collective agreement - would you also say that every worker has a right not to work with that particular person if and when he chooses not to? Would you give him the right to say that if that person who doesn't believe in associating with me and therefore doesn't want to pay his union dues, do I have the right of not associating with him and do I have the right to then stop working and appeal for the public to support me in my position? Because that's what it implies.

Mr. Speaker, labour relations has not moved in that direction. I believe that they will move in that direction inevitably because I believe that that is the only fair direction and I believe that this bill is a step in that direction because this bill removes some of the legislative restrictions that have been imposed and it also counterbalances some of the restrictions that have been imposed on trade unionists, because right now during the term of a collective agreement and in accordance with Bill 81, a group of people cannot leave their employment because a person has come in whom they don't wish to associate with, and therefore the Minister of Labour says because that is going to create a disagreement and because we have taken away their right to walk out while that man is on the plant, and because there are people who believe that industrial stability is important at all costs, having taken away their right to walk out during the terms of a collective agreement, we will have to put in a counterbalance which said that there will no longer be any argument with regard to union security, that once a union is established within a plant, union security is assured so there will be no breakdown of industrial stability on that point.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with that, and if that sounds radical then I'm going to quote, Mr. Speaker, from a non radical: The Honourable Mr. Justice G. E. Tritschler - is that a sufficiently, acceptable, conservative authority, Mr. Speaker - because in the report of the Brandon Packers Strike Commission there were numerous recommendations - the Honourable Member for Fort Garry is shaking his head - there were numerous recommendations that there be a law prohibiting the present union shop. Let's recall that there are many collective agreements now in existence in the Province of Manitoba which give Rand Formula in union shops. This is not something new. There are people who say that they don't want to associate with somebody who are now working under conditions where their union dues are deducted -- and that is what Rand Formula is. I heard the Leader of the Liberal Party on television, I heard him describe Rand Formula as the right of a person to have their union dues designated to a charity, that's what I heard on television. Well, Mr. Speaker, I've read Rand Formula, I've read Mr. Justice Rand's decision in the Ford Motor Case which is what Rand Formula is, and all he said was that since there is a collective bargaining agency formed that everybody who would get the benefit of that bargaining relationship should pay the cost of administering it, which is the cost of the union dues. Not that they become members of the union, nobody is requiring anybody to be a member of the union. All that is being required is that they pay the cost of administering the union -- which has already been chosen. It's not compulsory unionism, this only applies where there is an application for certification, where their application -- and here I'll give a mark to the Leader of the Opposition, I don't want to give it to him very strong, but I'll give it to him - is supported by over 50 percent of the members of the unit, and the Leader of the Opposition says that the act doesn't say that.

Mr. Speaker, I read the act and he's right, I couldn't find the words that it contains over 50 percent of the members. But what it says, Mr. Speaker, is that the board if it receives an application based on 35 percent of the membership shall hold a vote and determine the wishes of the members. Mr. Speaker, I would assume that everybody would read it, but I want to give the Leader of the Opposition the credit of saying that it doesn't say that there has to be over 50 percent. I guess it doesn't say in our Legislative Assembly Act that a resolution must receive over 50 percent of the votes cast, and yet for years we have been going along, Mr. Speaker, on the assumption that it means over 50 percent. But really, I'm trying not to make fun of this because the point was raised and if it requires clarity then the Minister of Labour should clarify it, and it will not be, Mr. Speaker, because it was brought to his attention by that labour expert the Leader of the Liberal Party who says that the clause with regard to under 35 percent was brought to the attention of the House by himself. If it were necessary to do so, Mr. Speaker, I would show him memos dated before his address which indicated that there was an ambiguity about the third portion of that clause. But if he needs something to go to the workers of

(MR. GREEN cont'd) Manitoba with to show the contribution that he made to the Labour Relations Bill, Mr. Speaker, I give him that particular point that he brought up that there is an ambiguity about getting a vote if there is less than 35 percent.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, what has to happen is an application has to be made, that application can be made with 35 percent of the people who claim to be members, it then has to be supported by over 50 percent -- and here I am speaking from memory but I think I am right -- you then have to get a collective agreement; that the check-off of union dues does not take place until a collective agreement is arrived at, and that what is then occurring, Mr. Speaker -- I wonder if these people whose religious opinions prevent them from paying part of the cost of administering that union, I wonder if their religious opinions prevent them from taking the increases that are given by the collective bargaining agent when that collective agreement is negotiated? I didn't see in any of those letters of the people who are talking in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ who said that they are prohibited from having, not being members of unions, but paying the cost of administering their servicing under the collective agreement, I never heard any of them say that they will not take the increases that are negotiated by the union on their behalf. Mr. Speaker, I just . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: On a point of order. Are the union dues going to be based just on the expenses that will be incurred on these particular agreements?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. That is not a point of order. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: I'm not going to deal with the question in its detail, I'm dealing with the question in principle that was presented to me by letter saying that "I am prohibited with associating with non believers". I wonder if that includes Mr. Justice G. E. Tritschler as being a non believer, because Mr. Tritscher said in his report, "The right of employees to bargain collectively and not individually is basic as is the right of the majority to choose the bargaining agent and the need of the bargaining agent to be paid. Eleven. That all who benefit from the services of the bargaining agent should share in the payment appeals to ones sense of justice." I want to repeat that for the honourable member - "that all who benefit from the services of the bargaining agent should share in the payment appeals to ones sense of justice." Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to leave a misimpression. Mr. Justice Tritschler went on to say, "It is probable that there are very few who accepting the obligation to pay the equivalent of union dues for services rendered will object on principle to union membership. If there is a significant body of such conscientious objectors, consideration should be given to their relief". Now, Mr. Speaker, first of all he says "object to union membership". Union membership, enforced union membership is not provided for in this legislation; what is provided for is Rand Formula. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, how does this question relate to anything else that society does? What does society do in cases of that kind? You know, I know that Joanne Baez objected to paying that portion of her income tax on religious grounds - her religion - and many Quakers in the United States did the same thing, objected to paying that portion of the income tax which went to killing people in Indonesia. You know what society said to those conscientious objectors? Said, go to jail. That's what it said, and they did go to jail. --(Interjection)-- Pardon me?

Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge wants to object to that portion of her Canadian taxes which goes to - let us say subsidizing - a particular industry that may be supplying war materials to the slaughter of people in Indochina, if she wants to object and wants to withhold that portion of her taxes, then Canadian society will say to her, go to jail. There is no difference in this respect between Canadian society or American society. If you thought that your religion prevented you -- if this act, Mr. Speaker, if we subsequently pass a law saying that we are going to give aid to religious organizations which I conscientiously object to, and I say I am going to withhold that portion of my taxes which goes to finance that religion, then the Honourable Member for Rhineland will say, put him in jail, that's what he will say. But that's, Mr. Speaker, a normal thing. That's why Thoreau went to jail and at least she said that he was doing it, and he said that I disbelieve in the payment of these taxes, here take me and put me in jail.

Mr. Speaker, we are not talking about that, we are talking about a law, and I see no difficulty insofar as my position is concerned, you're talking about a law which says that where a majority of the people say that they want a union to bargain on their behalf, where that group is certified in accordance with our Labour Relations Act -- all of which I disagree with.

(MR. GREEN cont'd) Thirdly, if they are able to arrange a collective agreement with their employer those employees that are covered by the collective agreement will not have to join the union, they will have to pay their share of the administration costs of negotiating that collective agreement, which is the union dues. Now the honourable member will say well part of that union dues may some day go to the support of a political party. I rather hope it does. My only complaint in this regard, Mr. Speaker, is that we have not been getting enough, not that we've been getting too much. But since when, Mr. Speaker, has there been a conscientious objection permitted in this case.

When I was a shareholder of the International Nickel Company of Canada, and when I was a shareholder of Sherritt-Gordon and they made, Mr. Speaker -- and you know I believe that they did, I'm not sure, but I know a little bit about this type of thing -- they made contributions to the Liberal and Conservative parties which affected my subsequent dividend, did I have a right to say that I, on conscientious grounds, object to that money which is being paid to the Liberal and Conservative Party and I demand a rebate, Mr. Speaker, of that particular portion which would have been paid to me as a dividend if they had not sent it off. --(Interjection)-- What's that? --(Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker, I did not have to buy the shares, and the ultimate answer to my honourable friend is that they do not have to work at that particular place. They do not have to ultimately -- you know, some people can only make a living by buying shares. There are some people who can't do anything else and they may in order to survive have to live off dividends; and, Mr. Speaker, the fact is that they may find that dividends of a particular company which pays money to the Liberal or Conservative Party is the only one which they can make a living at. And it is similarly true that some employees feel that they would like to work in a particular place. They don't have to work in that place. They could choose a place where they will find only believers working alongside with them -- and by the way it's an interesting thing, two people came to my home on Saturday -- Mr. Speaker, on the basis that they were Christians who could not work alongside of union people. Mr. Speaker, I asked them, do they work in a place where there is a collective agreement and where there would be a union shop and they said, no, this doesn't affect me, but it affects some mythical person who may be in that position.

Mr. Speaker, just as I don't have to join the Law Society, I can avoid joining the Law Society and do something else. I can practise -- yes, I could practise some other profession - witchcraft. Mr. Speaker, I happen to think that the Law Society is a pretty good thing. You know it doesn't do bad by its members and therefore I want to join the Law Society, and in order to participate in the benefits that statutes have afforded to me by virtue of having a membership in that organization, I gladly pay the dues. And, Mr. Speaker, the fact is that there is no force, ultimate force in any of these sections, but there is, I will agree, pressure of circumstances. But pressure of circumstances has never been relieved against by the government. The fact is that when one joins a particular organization one hopes that that organization will prosper but one doesn't expect that because they happen to be in that particular organization they are entitled as a right to get everything that society has offered to other organizations. When I joined the Manitoba New Democratic Party we were a very small force and the Conservative Party was in government. Did I have a right to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am entitled to govern because I'm a member of a political party. I probably chose a party which people said was going to leave me in the wilderness for many years, but that didn't happen. And the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that we are now as a result of that, in the process of dealing with legislation which is not new. I mean the biggest argument that has been brought up by members on the other side is that this is an earthshaking thing, that the public should have a right to express their opinion on it.

I want to tell the Leader of the Opposition, the Leader of the Liberal Party that the public has been presenting their opinion on these issues for the last ten years that I am aware of, and I am certain, Mr. Speaker, for the last 50 years of which I am not aware of. And after all of the expressions of public opinion it'll still come down to what kind of legislation you want. And we have had those public meetings that the Honourable Member the Leader of the Liberal Party is talking about. We had those public meetings in 1966 in the month of June; and we had those public meetings again in the month of June in 1969 and we went and tested our opinions and we fought for our opinions and as a result of that participation in the democratic process we were told, "we think that you people are saying the kind of thing that we like and we want you to now go ahead and do it." And having now gone ahead, come to office for the purpose of doing it, is

(MR. GREEN cont'd) the public expecting us to abdicate our position and go back to them and ask them what to do? Not on this question, Mr. Speaker, not on this question. This question has basic divisions within it and those divisions won't be solved by any sort of public presentation because after the public presentations are over I predict as night follows day that there will be the same division on these questions that there is right now. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party says that we don't want to hear what big business has to say or what the union leaders have to say, we want the rank and file.

Mr. Speaker, why is it that once a person is elevated to some elective office to act as representative that he suddenly is precluded from being a person who represents the opinion of the people whom he worked with and who elected him? Why is it that the union representative is one who is least able to speak for the employees? The employees have a right to change that union representative, or does the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party say that they can't change that union representative? Because there is one change today. I just received notice, Mr. Speaker, that one of those big union leaders, Johnny Pullen of the Electrical Workers, who's a very good fellow and I'm sure that the union wasn't expressing anything terrible against Mr. Pullen, but he has now been changed at an election where they elected another person, Mr. Thiessen. I presume that what the Leader of the Liberal Party would now say is that because Mr. Thiessen has been elected and Mr. Pullen has been defeated we should find out what Mr. Pullen wants because he properly expresses the views of that particular union and Thiessen having been elected is a big union boss and he no longer represents them. Because, Mr. Speaker, that is the end conclusion of his position.

I am certain, Mr. Speaker, that we will hear from Mr. Pullen, we will hear from Mr. Thiessen or people representing counterparts; we will hear from Mr. Tkach, we will hear from all kinds of people, but in the last analysis those representations are going to come down to a question of what kind of labour law do you like. And although this particular type of labour law is not my choice I say that it is a progression, that it is an inevitable result of the kind of labour laws that we have had up until now. And, Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation in passing it and I say to the Leader of the Liberal Party that if he says that his vote in favour of this legislation on second reading is not a vote in principle in favour of the bill then he is introducing an entirely new concept in the legislative process. Because a vote in favour on second reading is a vote in favour of the principle of the bill. I believe that the principle of the bill, Mr. Speaker, is essentially a freeing up of the collective bargaining process. On that basis, although it's not perfect because it moves in the direction of freedom in collective bargaining as against restriction in collective bargaining, I am going to vote for this bill and I am going to vote against the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well we've heard from the Member for Inkster again and he's done a marvelous job of changing things completely around as he usually does. I firmly believe that the Member from Inkster is so positive on his ideas that everything is black and everything is white, there's nothing green in-between at all. I assure you that there is absolutely no give and take of opinion whatsoever. He will be standing in the middle of the ocean one day going down saying I believe, and I'm afraid that when it comes to that point of view that isn't conscience and that isn't anything that is really spirit, that boils down to being straight stubbornness and not seeing the other point of view.

Mr. Speaker, when he says that the union steward came along and said to the man, "If this man is not paying union dues by tomorrow morning he will be working here alone," I can't see any difference in that at all. If he can't work there because he's not paying them or the rest of them won't work there because he's not paying them obviously that man is out of a job and also society and everybody else will be very much hurt. That's the basic thing that happens no matter which way you go on that particular situation.

So, the Member for Inkster basically says also that because so many people would be out because of one we have to change it around and force, basically force, the one to be back in. Now, really that is not what we're looking for in democracy or the human rights and on that particular case it has been overcome in other areas, can be overcome here, and in this case, Sir, what we are doing is we are basically saying that government -- it's not the same as the Law Society -- government is basically putting through legislation which will be of benefit to the union and that is not going to be much of a benefit to many of the employees who have to pay off these dues. Nobody on this side has argued about the collective bargaining situation but this particular piece of legislation is really really becoming that type of legislation which is only beneficial to the unions.

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd)

When my friend the Member for Brandon West mentioned that the unions might not be beneficial I'd like to quote from the book here again. It says "Union organizers publicly acclaim CCF government for benefits it has conferred on workers, but privately they wish the government hadn't quite gone so far with its labour legislation. Their jobs would be easier as organizers if the socialists had left them with a few things they could fight and bargain for with both government and management. An aggrieved ex-organizer made no bones about the fact that the CCF government has made things tough for union recruiters who earn their paycheck persuading workers to join trade unions. Union organizers in other provinces think we have a picnic here because we've got good pro-labour Santa Claus in the legislative building. Talk to workers about organizing they say; they say why do we need a union the government takes care of us. Not only is it tough to organize workers it's becoming a problem to hang onto the unions we've got and that would be a shame. With the government providing for them they don't think they're getting value for their union dues and they're probably right." And later on a section here says "Labour law here in Saskatchewan is not for the worker the way it is being interpreted by the government appointed Labour Relations Board it is for the unions. In many instances the workers have gone on record saying they did not want to be represented by a certain union but they have had that union foisted upon them despite their petitions and sworn statements."

Mr. Speaker, that is exactly the same thing that is going to be happening in the Province of Manitoba. This is basically the NDP Government of Manitoba's bible, you know, "Douglas in Saskatchewan". So it is really something. I keep hearing comments from the Member from Crescentwood during this whole debate and my basic opinion of his beliefs it is marvelous to have people wandering around in limbo to be controlled and then you really take over society. That's the way he'd like it and that's what he's working for.

Mr. Speaker, I tell you that I have dwelt on my opinions of this bill previously and there is no reason why I should change because I haven't heard any reason to change and I'll tell you why we believe this should be a white paper. In 1970 we got into July and August and said let's go to Committee on Autopac. And what was committee on Autopac - a tremendous amount of hearings and then it went clause by clause like that. Any amendments that came up were brushed aside and boom the bill went through --(Interjection)-- That's right rammed it through. I'm sitting holding 93 amendments to the Winnipeg Act and what did we do. We sat there in July, Sir, and what happened again. I got through one small amendment. I remember the government turning around and joking with me saying "you got one Frank, you got an amendment through". One small amendment and here we've got 93 amendments to the Winnipeg Act. You've got a report from the Law Reform Commission on the Winnipeg Act, all through here of changes that should be made to the Act. And what do we say? Put it to committee where we'll have the hearing. Oh, oh it'll be very nice to hear from the labourers, the big business; and the Member from Wolseley, said he'd been here six days, he doesn't remember what we've gone through with you guys for three years by saying put it to committee, put it to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The hour of adjournment has arrived. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Finance that the House do now adjourn and stand adjourned until 8:00 o'clock this evening.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I assure my honourable friend as far as the government is concerned we would love to hear him continue his contribution to Bill 81, providing of course he stays to Bill 81.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned till 8:00 p. m. (Monday).